REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 19, 2006, rejecting claims 1-46 and 48. In view of the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, removal of the rejections, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5-25, 27-42, 44-46 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,173,311 to Hassett et al., hereinafter "Hassett". Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that claims 18 and 39 contain limitations similar to those set forth in claim 1 and that claims 18 and 39 are rejected for similar rationale as set forth with respect to claim 1. Applicant traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 provides a method for serving requests for Internet information files in an Internet caching system. The method includes: receiving, at a local Internet cache server, a user request from a user for an Internet information file; in response to the received request, making a query for said information file, if said information file has not been cached by said local server; in response to a reply to said query, making a file request for said information file, wherein said file request is directed to a feeder means if said reply indicates that a central file server, storing cached Internet information files, has said information file cached; and querying, from said feeder means in response to said file request, said central file server for said information file, in order to decrease the load on said central file server.

Hassett describes a method and system for servicing client requests (abstract). The systems and methods disclosed in Hassett include such features as 1) sending an ID of the last article sent to a client, 2) load balancing servers and 3) redundant servers (col. 5, lines 33-39).

An intranet 240 includes workstations 200, a caching proxy server 210 and a firewall (and/or proxy server) 230 (col. 7, lines 1-5). Workstations 200 communicate to caching proxy server 210 having a data cache 220, which communicates with firewall 230 via intranet 240 (col. 7, lines 1-5). Intranet communicates with a destination computer 260 having a database 270, via Internet 250 (col. 7, lines 5-8). To begin operation of caching proxy server 210, a "proxy_GET" request is sent to destination computer 260 (col. 7, lines 18-21). Destination computer 260 transmits a table to caching proxy server 210 to determine which proxy server agent will serve the GET request (col. 7, lines 22-24). Destination computer 260 receives the proxy_GET transmission from the client, and either redirects the client to the caching proxy server, or transmits to client 1) HTTP 204 and 2) NEXT_UPDATE value and the client receives the transmission from the destination computer (col. 8, lines 14-27).

Hassett also describes a System Data Center network that includes database servers, feed servers, Servers and monitoring tools (col. 14, lines 19-27). Load simulation tests are performed (col. 14, lines 29-30). As shown in Fig. 16, the Data Center includes numerous feed servers in communication with a database (DB) feed server (Fig. 16).

Hassett further describes operations of a cache in conjunction with a client, for example in Fig. 18. There are three possible results when the local cache is queried: hit, miss, or another client is already on its way to a datacenter for the desired data items (col. 17, lines 54-57). The use of a cache manager thread for updating and managing a cache eliminates the need for a server client to update the cache after fetching data items (col. 18, lines 4-6).

Hassett thus describes networks having one or more servers, such as proxy servers, database servers and feed servers. As with conventional servers, the servers of Hassett are queried for information files, and retrieve those files from other sources if the requested information files are not stored in the queried cache. However, none of the servers disclosed in Hassett is a feeder in communication with both a central file server and a local server, as recited in claim 1. The feeder is an intermediate device, separate from the central server, that is responsible for accepting and replying to queries and/or requests for files in lieu of the central

server. Specifically, none of the servers in Hassett perform this function of receiving queries from clients intended for a central server to reduce the number of queries on a central server, receiving a file request when it is determined that the central server contains the requested file, and further querying the central server for the requested file.

The feed servers of Hassett are simply servers for receiving and storing information from multiple sources; they do not perform the above function of receiving a query and determining whether a file is stored on a central server. Likewise, the load simulation tests and the cache manager thread disclosed in Hassett do not perform the function of receiving and replying to queries in place of the central server.

Consequently, Hassett does not describe, teach or otherwise suggest "receiving, at a local Internet cache server, a user request from a user for an Internet information file; in response to the received request, making a query for said information file, if said information file has not been cached by said local server; in response to a reply to said query, making a file request for said information file, **wherein said file request is directed to a feeder means if said reply indicates that a central file server**, storing cached Internet information files, has said information file cached; and querying, from said feeder means in response to said file request, said central file server for said information file, in order to decrease the load on said central file server", as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5-17 and 36 depend from claim 1. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claims 2, 5-17 and 36 are patentable over Hassett.

Claims 18 and 39 include features similar to claim 1. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 1, claims 2, 5-17, 36 are patentable over Hassett.

Claims 19-25, 27-35, 37, 38 and 48 depend from claim 18, and claims 41, 42 and 44-46 depend from claim 39. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claims 18 and 39, claims 19-25, 27-35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44-46 and 48 are patentable over Hassett.

For the above reasons, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-25, 27-42, 44-46 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hassett is overcome. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-25, 27-42, 44-46 and 48 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Paragraph 41 of the Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 26 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassett in view of *ICP and the Squid Web Cache* by Wessels et al., hereinafter "Wessels". Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As discussed above, Hassett does not teach or suggest a feeder in communication with a central file server and a local server. Thus, Hassett does not disclose or suggest the elements of claims 1, 18 or 39.

Wessels discloses an Internet Cache Protocol used for communication among web caches (abstract). However, Wessels does not teach a feeder in communication with a central file server and a local server, as discussed above and provided in claims 1, 18 and 39.

Consequently, neither Hassett nor Wessels teach or suggest "receiving, at a local Internet cache server, a user request from a user for an Internet information file; in response to the received request, making a query for said information file, if said information file has not been cached by said local server; in response to a reply to said query, making a file request for said information file, **wherein said file request is directed to a feeder means if said reply indicates that a central file server**, storing cached Internet information files, has said information file cached; and querying, from said feeder means in response to said file request, said central file server for said information file, in order to decrease the load on said central file

server", as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Hassett and Wessels, whether considered alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the elements of claims 1, 18 and 39. Thus, claims 1, 18 and 39 are patentable over the cited combination of Hassett and Wessels.

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 1, claim 26 depends from claim 18, and claim 43 depends from claim 39. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claims 1, 18 and 39, claims 3-4, 26 and 43 are patentable over the cited combination of Hassett and Wessels.

For the above reasons, the rejection of claims 3-4, 26 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassett in view of Wessels is overcome. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-4, 26 and 43 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

This application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Because the reasons above are sufficient to traverse the rejections, Applicant has not explored, nor does he now present, other possible reasons for traversing such rejections. Nonetheless, Applicant expressly reserves the right to do so, if appropriate, in any future proceeding and/or response to any future Office Actions.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time.

If an additional fee is required, authorization is hereby given to charge such additional fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3569.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 20, 2006

By _____

Thomas Ryan (Reg. No. 52,187)
Eric E. Grondahl (Reg. No. 46,741)
MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
City Place I
185 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3495
Ph.: (860) 275-7005
Fax: (860) 724-3397